

JOURNAL OF THE SOCIETY OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH

EDITED BY SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

PROFESSOR IN THE WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, CHICAGO

Volume IV

MARCH, 1920

Number I

ASSYRIAN MORALS

By SAMUEL A. B. MERCER, Western Theological Seminary, Chicago

I. INTRODUCTION

THE subject of this paper is morals and not ethics. Ethics is the science of morals, and concerns itself with the principles of human duty. So far as is known the Assyrians never drew up a system of ethics. Morals has to do with the habits of life in regard to right and wrong conduct. The subject matter of the morals of any ancient people may be gleaned from their extant literature. It can then be classified and studied in the light of that which was held to be "right" and "wrong" by the people and custom of the time under consideration.

In studying Assyrian morals we shall be dealing with the Assyrian idea of goodness, truth, justice, righteousness, purity, and faithfulness, on the one hand; and, on the other hand, with that of evil, falsehood, injustice, wickedness, impurity, and faithlessness.

Men, everywhere and at all times, have differentiated between good and bad. But the content of "good" and "bad" varies with times and places. The Assyrians, in common with the Sumerians and Babylonians, would have defined "good" as that which is pleasing to the gods, and "evil" as that which incites the anger of the gods. And what they considered to have been pleasing to the gods was not always necessarily "moral" in our sense of the term, but may have been merely what we call "ceremonial." It was, however, none the less "moral" in the eyes of the Assyrians. In fact, our own "moral" distinctions are based upon what we consider to be the will of God, that is, to a large extent, upon what has become customary. In like manner, what the gods willed, the

Assyrians considered right, and what they disapproved, the Assyrians considered wrong. In other words, what was customary was right, and what was not customary was wrong.

Now, the Assyrians, as well as we, thought that the gods willed justice, righteousness, purity, etc. But their idea of justice, righteousness, and purity may have been different from ours. If we can discover what acts and relationships the Assyrians considered to be just, righteous, pure, etc., we shall be in a position to estimate their morals. This is the object of our study.

Before beginning our investigation we should remind ourselves that a generous allowance must be made for a wide gap between the ideal and the real. We must be careful not to confuse what were actual practices with what were merely ideals; although the ideals will be valuable as indications of what the Assyrians knew to be best, and of what they tried to attain. We should also remember that the Assyrians were the heirs of Sumerian and Early Babylonian culture, and what was customary in Sumerian and Early Babylonian times must be assumed to have been customary in Assyria, provided no evidence to the contrary be found. Yet, in this article no use has been made of any evidence other than Assyrian. The conclusions will thus be based upon contemporaneous inscriptions.

The sources¹ used are: (1) Assyrian historical inscriptions, (2) Assyrian contracts and deeds, (3) Assyrian letters, and (4) a few hymns and prayers of certain date. No use has been made of the majority of poetical and religious literature, such as, epics, legends, omens, incantations, hymns and liturgies, because of the uncertainty of the date of nearly all such literature. It has been considered best, for the present, to base our conclusions upon only those inscriptions whose dates are certain. In this way our conclusions may be less complete than they would have been had we made use of all poetical and religious literature, but the use of this latter would have introduced a large element of uncertainty.

¹ For abbreviations see JSOR I, 49. Others of less common use are: ADB = C. H. W. Johns, *An Assyrian Doomsday Book*, Leipzig, 1901; HL = R. F. Harper, *Assyrian and Babylonian Letters*, London and Chicago, 1892 ff.; KA = L. W. King and E. A. W. Budge, *Annals of the Kings of Assyria*, London, 1902; KUA = J. Kohler and A. Ungnad, *Assyrische Rechtsurkunden*, Leipzig, 1913 ff.; SA = M. Streck, *Assurbanipal* (VAB), Leipzig, 1916.

Whereas, the picture of Assyrian morals drawn by means of a study of material which can with certainty be dated will serve as a criterion in an attempt, which must be made sooner or later, to determine the date of all poetical and religious inscriptions in cuneiform.

My method in this study has been: first, to assemble all moral materials in all inscriptions known to represent the Assyrian period, classifying them, so as to show what the family, social, international, and transcendental virtues and vices were; and secondly, to estimate Assyrian morals by an examination of the moral ideals of the Assyrians, of their idea of moral evil, of the question of their free will, of the determinants of their individual and social life, and of their moral sanctions. In this estimation great care has been exercised in differentiating between individual and national morals.

II. MORAL MATERIALS IN ASSYRIAN INSCRIPTIONS

1. *Family Virtues and Vices*

The basis of Assyrian society, as of all society, was the family, which began with the marriage of two persons, as man and wife (ADB 25). What the detailed laws of marriage were we do not know; and are, therefore, dependent upon our knowledge of Sumerian and Babylonian usage for a general conception of Assyrian practice. As in the earlier periods so now marriage was undoubtedly a legal ceremony, in preparation for which a contract was drawn up.

Monogamy was the rule, as it was in Babylonia, but polygamy had become more prevalent than in the earlier period (ADB 26), and had become common among serfs and slaves (ADD iii, 385 f.). A wife could be acquired in various ways, the most common being by mutual attraction between man and woman, by purchase, and by seizure (KUA 37). Concubines and slave wives were usually bought or acquired by capture.

The husband was the head of the family, and retained the right of selling his children into slavery (JBAL 173; ADD 186, 201, 314, 319, 221, 307, 315, 317). The same right pertained to the mother (KUA 39), and even a brother could sell his sister as a slave (ADD 207, 208). The wife continued to hold a very high place in Assyria, and women in general possessed considerable independence. They were educated (ADD 827), and could act as governors of certain

cities and districts (*šakintu*). They could buy and sell on their own account, and have a retinue of servants (KUA 483, 553, 558, etc., etc.). And although they did not take such a prominent part in contracts as in the earlier period (AJSL 30, 196 ff.; KUA 36), yet they never surrendered their right to appear in court (KUA 643, 655). There is evidence that they sometimes assumed important rôles in political affairs, although with a certain diffidence; for example, a woman prayed to Šamaš about a reported uprising against Ašurbanipal, but apologises to the god for the fact that she is a woman (AJSL 29, 24-25).

The legal position of children was preserved. Their right to inherit was a legal one, which did not depend upon the existence of a will (JBAL 224). But a man or woman could adopt children (KUA 41), and the adoption carried with it a full share in the estate (OLZ 6, 198). Whether or not slaves were adopted, as in earlier and later periods, is not clear (ADD 637).

What means could have been taken in Assyria for the interruption of the marriage relationship cannot be learned from the extant material, but it may be assumed that they were similar to those in force in Sumeria and Babylonia.

2. Social Virtues and Vices

Assyrian culture was borrowed, and her society retained the old structure: the *amêlu*, which included the king, the chief officers of state, and landed proprietors; the *muškenu*, which included the bulk of the subject population; and the *ardu* or slave. The last class was more developed in Assyrian times than previously. The rights of domestic slaves, married slaves, and serfs were clearly differentiated. At the head stood the king as representative of the gods. He was commander-in-chief of the armies, priest, and judge. He was the fountain of all law, and, though sometimes influenced by his nobles, was hampered by no regularly constituted council. The Assyrian kings were famous for their military pride. Their inscriptions are loaded with high-sounding boasts of military prowess. But as the earthly representative of the gods, and as the fount of truth, they loved to announce their good and righteous deeds. They protected the weak against the strong (SA 226, 11), they were the guardians of justice and lovers of righteousness (KB II, 83),

and boasted that they were always solicitous for the welfare of their people (KA 63, etc.). In trouble the people felt that they could appeal to their king (HL 2), for he was the chosen priest of the gods (KA 96)

The relation of individual to individual was pretty well regulated by custom and law. In the case of disputes there is much evidence to show that attempts were duly made to bring about settlements by mutual concession and compromise. Private contracts (ADD 779-782) show that about the same individual legal relationships existed now as in the earlier periods. The standard of private morality was very high. The virtues of love, mercy, justice, sympathy, kindness, loyalty, and piety are well authenticated. But, of course, the opposite vices were sufficiently common, though not notably so.

Due respect for established law was not wanting in Assyria. So far as is known she adopted her laws and all their paraphernalia from Babylonia. At any rate, we find in Assyrian society that law is the all-pervading order. It regulated everything. Buying and selling, borrowing and lending, fines and acquittances, punishments and rewards, all came under the law. The people had supreme confidence in the law-courts as safeguards, and a high sense of justice; law and order prevailed. There were those who found fault, just as the letter writer who declared that "justice has been in abeyance since Sargon" (HL 43); bribing was not unknown (HL 2); disingenuous pleading (*dabābu*) found its place; but fines were fair (ADD 160) and an earnest effort was made to administer justice. In order to bring this about, the greatest care was exercised, for example, in the choice of witnesses, who had to be personally identified.

Punishments in Assyria were usually very severe. No doubt the idea of prevention is in part to blame. But it was perhaps chiefly due to inheritance, and to the general severe and warlike character of the Assyrians. The historical inscriptions nearly always end in curses which give an idea of what would happen to a desecrator of the memorial of a king if he were caught (e.g., KA 11 f.). In commercial cases there is as a rule no fixed relation between the price and the penalty (ADD 605). In many cases the penalty imposed in serious matters is the devotion of a child to the services

of a god (ADD 310, 436, 474, 491, 632). The usual word rendered "devote" is *šarâpu*, "to burn." But, while human sacrifice may have been common in similar connections in earlier times, there is no further evidence in Assyrian times that this word could not be rendered "devote" or "dedicate." On the other hand, there is reason to believe that penalties in Assyrian were not so severe as in early Babylonian times, when the custom of human sacrifice on such occasions is certainly not known. In fact, there was growing in Assyria a tendency to use moral suasion as a penalty, just as when a man who sought to invalidate a contract was to be scorned and mocked (ADD 617).

The legal profession was highly respected. At the head stood Ašur the *bêl dînišu*, lord of right. Under him was the king, his representative; and the king was, in turn, represented by a chief justice, *sartênu*, whose place might be taken by a *hazânu*, chief civil magistrate, or a *sukallu*, chamberlain, or one of many other high officials (ADD § 567). The ordinary judge, *daiânu*, was the man who on all ordinary occasions presided, judged, and decided. All testimony had to be made on oath, which took the form of divine invocation (ADD 161) or malediction (AJSL 30, 196 ff.). The unfaithful violator of such promises was to be severely punished.

Property rights were highly developed, and were possessed by all classes of people and by women and children as well as by men. Great state officials had their endowments that went with the office (JBAL 194, 216), and donations of property could be legally made to anyone (ADD 619). To recover alienated or lost property sons, grandsons, brothers, brother's sons, and females of the same relationship, as well as certain civil officials, could take action (JBAL 232). The penalty in a property case was usually a payment to the temple treasury.

Trade and business were placed on a firm foundation. Sales, purchases, endowments, commissions, loans, inheritance, wills, settlements, gifts, partnerships, and all kinds of business transactions were legal contracts. Receipts for payment were demanded; the notary's fee had to be paid; and there was no turning back from a bargain (ADD pp. 35 ff.; JBAL 232). Loans were negotiated on approval, and were often secured by real estate and slaves (ADD 58). They were often made without any interest at seed

time or harvest (JBAL 197), but there was usually an interest, though it was never fixed, which rose as high as 300 per cent per annum. In certain cases the king's official might borrow of the temple (ADD 930). Guarantees were often demanded of the seller, especially in the case of slave-sale, to guard against disease (ADD iii, 288-368); and security was taken for payment (ADD 164). One person could act for another by power of attorney (*bêl kâtâti*) (ADD 94, 152). Contracts for labour named both wages and time-limit. Women entered freely into business relations in the absence of a male representative, and business not only showed a fine sense of legal discrimination, but was also permeated by piety as is seen by the frequent appeals to gods and goddesses.

The bulk of labour in Assyria was done by serfs and slaves; although there were freemen, especially freed slaves, who were labourers. People were slaves by birth, by purchase, by capture, by debt, or by choice. There were three classes of slaves, domestic, married, who lived in their own home, and serfs. The general term for slave is *ardu*, its feminine counterpart being *amtu*. It is not certain that the term *ardu* implied any disgrace, although a serf was never called an *ardu*. It seems that the term was more like the Roman *servus*, because the Assyrian *ardu* was possessed of considerable freedom. The content of the Assyrian word *ardu* was undoubtedly different from that of our word "slave." For instance, a person would sign himself "thy slave" without inferring thereby that he was an actual slave. Nevertheless slavery was a reality in Assyria.

Although their lot was not an enviable one, Assyrian slaves possessed definite rights and privileges. They could possess property (KUA 52, 54, etc.), transact business (KUA 52, 53), had a right to demand that their family be kept entire (KUA 58-59, etc.), were officially registered (KUA 112), could own slaves (KUA 50), and a slave could have two wives (ADD 229); they could marry the daughter of a freeman (JBAL 136), could act as witnesses (KUA 49, 83, 86, etc.), or even as principal in a contract (ADD 635), were held responsible in business (ADD 166), could learn trades (JBAL 173), and the head of a slave family was not liable for forced labour or corvée (JBAL 173). On the other hand a slave and all his property belonged to the master; and whether the slave did business for his master or not, the master had a certain income from

him (JBAL 172). However, the slave was rarely separated from his property (JBAL 172). The slave probably could not marry without his master's consent (JBAL 172), he could not live where he liked (*ib.*), the master could provide a wife for his slave (JBAL 171), the slave could be given as compensation to avoid blood-revenge (ADD 321), could be hired (ADD 637), and could be taken as guarantee for the payment of a fine (ADD 160).

The price of slaves varied. Males were usually more valuable than females, except under certain conditions (JBAL 183). As a rule, there were only one or two slaves to a household (JBAL 182). The master was responsible for his slave (ADD 637). Whether a slave could obtain his freedom in Assyrian times is not clear. He probably could, since such was possible in Babylonian, and since there is evidence to show that the Assyrian slave possessed more real freedom than at any other period in Semitic history (JBAL 171).

Serfs were on a higher social plane than slaves. Some of them were probably free men, although they were not free to move wherever they wished (JBAL 172). While they could be sold with a piece of land, they were free to work as they chose, they could own property, could claim implements from their master (JBAL 172), and were capable of inheritance (JBAL 173).

3. *International Virtues and Vices*

In Assyria's warlike literature there is little room for peaceful sentiments, although there is no trace of political disability on the part of foreigners in Assyria (KUA 36, 194, 443, 680, etc.), and oaths that bound Assyria to a foreign country in treaty were inviolable (KA 69 f.). However, Assyria was a great warlike country. She gloried in her armies and conquests. Her great war-gods, Ašur and Ištar, gave her all victory (KA 5, 29). All war was religious. It was to enhance the power of the gods, and to extend their boundaries (KA 34).

The army was recruited from all ranks, especially from serfs and slaves (JBAL 173), the military unit being the bowman and his pikeman and shield-bearer (ADD ii, 172). There is abundant evidence to show that the Assyrian kings and their armies were exceedingly cruel in battle. Corpses of enemies were mutilated (VR 3:3, 36, etc.), their lands were sowed with salt (KA 79 f.),

heads of the slain were exhibited in piles outside the cities (KA 37), and gathered to be counted by royal officials (A. Paterson, *Assyrian Sculptures*, The Hague, 1913, pl. 52). Although the kings were sometimes merciful (KA 71), they loved to boast of great cruelties and inhumanity (KA 278-279, 284, 294). Assyria was militaristic to the core, she exulted in conquest and all the cruelties which were believed to be capable of striking terror into the hearts of her enemies.

4. *Transcendental Virtues and Vices*

In Assyria men believed in the existence of many gods, though there was a tendency to exalt a few at the expense of the multitude. Ašur, Ištar, Šamaš, and Nabu were the most popular. The gods were the guardians of justice, and were considered the source of all right. This was particularly true of Šamaš and Ašur, while Ištar was the bestower of life, the merciful and compassionate deity. Nabu figured prominently in appeals for protection. The gods were feared and revered (HL 2), and were invoked to avenge wrong (ADD 161), and to punish the enemy without mercy (KA 179).

The kings considered themselves the direct agents of the gods, and governed the whole world in the interest of their patrons (KA 4). The gods would, therefore, protect and prosper all the king's interests (KA 3, 213). Ašur was the favourite of most of the Assyrian kings, but Adad-nirari developed great respect for Nabu, in whom and in no other, he advised his successors to trust.

There is not sufficient material to say just what the popular attitude towards the gods was, but there is no reason to doubt that, just as in Sumerian and early Babylonian times, so now, the masses were exceedingly religious, each individual having his own special protective deity. In fact, in letters, private and individual, numerous appeals are made to the gods; and so zealous were the Assyrians for the advancement of the god's cause that foreigners were sometimes forced to worship Assyrian deities (KA 71).

Divine worship was highly developed. The prevalent mode of worship was sacrifice, thank-offerings, votive-offerings, and dedications. Various were the materials of sacrifice. Generally animals, including horses (KUA 162, 164-178), sometimes wine and oil

(KA 104, 186), and sometimes human beings (KUA 158, 163; ADD 640, 641). It is not, however, certain that these children were offered in the sense of being slain. They may only have been dedicated to the services of the gods. Temples were built and carefully endowed, being provided with a fixed daily payment (ADD 998-1092), although there is no evidence that the payment was a tithe. There were prophets who interpreted the will of the gods and priests who served in the temple. The priesthood was highly developed in Assyria, and became hereditary (ADD 151). At the head of the priesthood stood the king, who is often represented as a priest (e.g., KA 6 f., etc.).

Prayer to the gods had become very common in Assyria, and shows a high spiritual sentiment. The gods were appealed to on all occasions, and there is evidence that the Assyrian approached his god directly, though the common mediator was the priest. The prayer could be directed to one (KA 9) or more gods (KA 103), and was earnest, fervent, and devoted.

III. ESTIMATION OF ASSYRIAN MORALS

1. *Moral Ideals*

In order to estimate the morals of any people or age a standard of judgment must be assumed. The most convenient criterion is the moral standard of our own age. By using this standard of judgment we can compare the moral ideas of any people or age with those of our own and decide whether they were higher or lower than ours. We may thus commend or condemn the morals of the people or age under consideration. But this criterion cannot be used to commend or condemn the morals of any individual of another people or age than our own. The individual must be commended or condemned on the basis of the morals of his own times — as to whether he has been true or false to them.

In order to compare the morals of the Assyrians with our own, our first task will be to find what their moral ideas were, and what was the content of their moral ideas. We shall, therefore, try to discover their moral ideals, their idea of moral evil, their moral determinants, whether they were conscious of a freedom of will or not, and what their moral sanctions were.

The Assyrians always ascribed the best they knew to their gods. If we can learn what that was we shall be in a position to state what their moral ideals were. The chief endeavour of the Assyrians was to please their gods, and in order to do that it was necessary that they should know what the will of the gods was. They saw the will of the gods in the customs and laws of their time, for the authorship of all law and precedent was ascribed to the gods. To obey the gods, then, was to be obedient to the custom and law of the time. The law, therefore, was the moral ideal.

But, what did Assyrian law consist in, or by what was it characterized? It consisted in justice, righteousness, and truth. But what was the content of justice, righteousness, and truth? Their content must necessarily have depended upon the customs and legal decisions of Assyrian times. The customs and laws of the times, then, will define the moral ideals of the Assyrians.

We shall, therefore, review the customs and legal decisions of the family, social, international, and transcendental life of the Assyrians in order to determine what the content of their moral ideals was.

In Assyria, family law and custom sanctioned polygamy, concubinage, and slavery, although the foundation of the normal family consisted of one man and one wife. Obedience, respect, and love were the elements of family life, and yet custom sanctioned the right of the parents to sell their children. Yet slavery was not so severe as in earlier times, and women had greater freedom than before, although the husband's rights continued to be out of proportion to those of his wife and children.

In all social affairs, justice and truth were the controlling principles, yet the caste system remained. The king claimed to be the "protector of right and lover of justice," to walk according to the will of the great gods (KA 109), and to be the "righteous one" whom Šamaš, judge of heaven and earth, should help (KA 29). But if we read carefully we shall find that when the king spoke of walking righteously, he referred to the destruction of his enemies (KA 261:22). In that he would be doing the will of his gods, but the will of his gods, as understood by him, was not what we would call "just." The king with the help of the gods walked righteously (KA 182:36), but that was equivalent to victory over, and merci-

lessness to, his enemies (KA 183). In business matters the ideal was justice and truth, although fines and punishments were disproportionate. There is no evidence that the *lex talionis* was abolished. It probably was not, as the idea seems to come out in certain fines, such as "ox for ox" or "sheep for sheep."

The international ideal in Assyria was *dannu*, "might." The Assyrians had little to say about peace, although they treated foreigners in their midst with more consideration than did the Sumerians and Babylonians.

Transcendentally, the moral ideal was obedience to the will of the gods. There were many gods. They were considered in an anthropomorphic way. They were of course the champions of Assyria. But within these limitations, there had developed a keen sense of the opposition of the gods to sinfulness. Whatever was considered sinful by the Assyrians was believed to be distasteful to the gods. It constituted an offence against the gods, and so "Ašurbanipal, bowing down in grief, made his prayer to Nabu his lord," saying, "I confess my sins to thee, Nabu, in the assembly of the great gods"; "in the whole multitude of my offences thou wilt not forsake me." And Nabu promises forgiveness (*Prayer of Ašurbanipal*). Of course, there was a great deal of magic and superstition; purity and spotlessness were often merely ceremonial, but truth (*kittu*) can always have but one meaning. A thing is so or it is not so. The Assyrian preferred truth to falsehood.

2. Moral Evil

Demons and evil spirits were the source of all evil (*limnu*). Evil was opposed to the will of the gods, and was, therefore, ceremonial as well as moral, for moral and ceremonial laws were not differentiated into moral and non-moral. Evil and sin were often equivalent to harm (CMI 61, 6), and, therefore, were colourless, morally. The enemy and the wicked are the same (KA 29:11; 52:34; 218:12-13). It was considered "bad" (*limnu*) for any foreign nation to oppose Assyria (KB II, 64). But evil, however considered, was always disparaged and severely punished.

In social life injustice was the great moral evil, though slavery was common; in international affairs defeat and failure were the source of most anxiety; in transcendental matters the moral evil

was impiety and the curse of the gods; but in family life we have no means of discovering what the Assyrians considered the greatest of evils. The idea of moral evil had not, in Assyria, become very discriminating.

As to a theory of the origin of evil, nothing is to be found in Assyrian inscriptions which is equivalent to the Paradise story of the Old Testament or the *yetzer* theory of later Judaism. The Assyrians were not metaphysicians. They realized the existence of evil, and assumed, without debate, that it came from the world of demons and evil spirits which surrounded them.

3. *Free Will*

In the hands of the gods lay the destiny of mankind (CMI 60, 24; KA 255:3). The gods determined destinies, but they did not interfere with the free will which every Assyrian exercised whenever he made an agreement or contract. But the matter as a problem never presented itself to the mind of the Assyrian, any more than did the problem of the origin of evil. He was, however, controlled by certain conditions of race and environment which always limited his action and determined his point of view. These were heredity, environment, and social traditions. His freedom or liberty in action must always be considered in the light of these conditions.

4. *Moral Sanction*

Moral sanctions may be either external or internal. They may refer to rewards or punishments imposed from without, or to consequences of conduct which arise spontaneously from within. The Assyrian respect for fair dealing in social life is the nearest approach we find to an internal moral sanction. They took real pleasure in this because they considered it in keeping with the law of the gods. They longed to enjoy life for its own sake and to attain to the desire of the heart (CMI 54, 21; 60, 18; KA 211:26-27; KB II, 80, 193-194). This was perhaps chiefly so because the future held out nothing worth while. Death was an unmitigated evil, the future was undesirable, and everything was done to gain the favour of the gods in this life.

The most potent Assyrian moral sanctions consisted in rewards and punishments imposed from without by an external authority

in the present life. The real aims of life were material blessings and prosperity, and success in war and in all private undertakings. The basis and sanction of morality was chiefly personal advantage, especially length of days (KA 94, 95, 166) and the blessing of the god and king (KA 388:3).

5. *Conclusion*

Our study of the morals of the Assyrians as a nation has revealed certain defects. Their idea of the deity was far inferior to ours, for while they considered the gods to be the source of all justice, truth, and righteousness, their justice, truth and righteousness were national and not international. Their gods were anthropomorphic and characterized by human imperfections. In family life, polygamy was very prevalent, much more than in Babylonia, and concubinage was permitted. Slavery was still common, and the power of parents over their children, and of a brother over his sister was excessive. The rights of women were still considerably limited, and perhaps even more so politically than in the Babylonian period. Punishments were often quite excessive, war was waged in a most cruel way, there had not yet developed a very keen sense of moral evil, and moral sanctions were mostly external. On the other hand, there was a tendency to exalt the character of the gods, and to pray to them with a deeper sense of their abhorrence of evil and sin. The lot of the slave was much better than in previous times, and business ethics had made considerable progress.

It should be noted at this point that such literature as the *Šurpu* series contains much valuable moral material, which would indicate a very considerable development in moral distinctions, if it could be shown that it belongs to the Assyrian period. But there is as yet so much doubt about the exact date of the originals of all such literature, and about how extensively it was redacted, that it cannot with safety be used. Otherwise it might affect our deductions considerably, especially as to the advance which the power of moral insight had made since the *Hammurapi* dynasty.

There is some reason to believe that the individual Assyrian had made considerable progress in his development of a sense of his own individuality. This appears in the newly acquired rights of serfs and slaves, and in the way in which their demands had been

forced upon society. It also comes out in the recognition of the rights of resident aliens, who were placed under no disabilities; and if our dated religious literature were more extensive this increase in personal and individual consciousness would probably be found to be paralleled by a deeper sense of personal responsibility.

In summing up, it may be said that the Assyrians were on a very much lower level of civilization than we are supposed to be. Although their cruelties in war may be paralleled in particular cases in modern times, yet these cruelties, unlike their modern parallels were habitual and had been practiced consistently and with full intention for centuries. The king gloried in such cruelties, as pleasing to the gods. Their conception of family life, and cruelties in punishment mark them as still comparatively barbaric. Otherwise, if estimated in the light of their own time they were, although severe, a pious and justice-loving people.

But the individual Assyrian must be judged in the light of his own day. His moral determinants must not be forgotten. He was circumscribed by heredity, which rendered the laws and customs of his time normal and natural. His environment and social tradition made him at his best a child of his own age. Estimated in this light, we have no reason to doubt that the Assyrian individual, though morally inferior when compared with the average citizen of a modern civilized state, was anything else than a pious, just, thoughtful, and law-abiding subject of his king and gods.

A SECOND BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SURVEY OF ASSYRIOLOGY

(YEARS 1918-1919)

By JOHN A. MAYNARD, New York City

THIS bibliography, being a continuation of *A Survey of Assyriology during the years 1915-1917*, JSOR 2²⁸⁻⁴⁶, will follow the same general order and use the same abbreviations. Numbers 1-364 refer to books or articles noticed in the *Survey*; numbers 365-555 refer to works mentioned here. Owing to unfavorable conditions a number of Continental publications could not be consulted; they will make the subject of a supplementary article. Our classification is under the following topics: Excavations and History of Assyriology (365-369), Texts (370), Languages cognate to Sumerian (371), Signs (372-375), Alphabet (376-377), Syllabaries (378-383), Sumerian Lexicography (384-388), Akkadian Lexicography (389-399), Sumerian Grammar (400-401), Akkadian Grammar (402-405), Geography (406-411), Chronology (412-418), History (419-431), Business Documents (432-452), Law (453-456), Letters (456-460), Civilization (461-467), Names, Myths (468-483), Literature (484), Religious Texts (485-494), Religion (495-519), Divination (520-525), Mathematics and Astronomy (526-527), Metrology (528-530), Art (531-532), Cylinders (533-536), Medicine (537-541), Zoölogy (542-544), Babel and Bible (545-555).

EXCAVATIONS AND HISTORY OF ASSYRIOLOGY. Fossey reviewed Koldewey's *Wieder Erstehende Babylon* JA 1918⁵²⁷⁻⁵³². M. Pillet's article on the Place Expedition (Cf. 5) was continued in *L'Expédition scientifique et artistique de Mésopotamie et de Médie*, 1851-1855, RA 15^{87-94, 146-154, 197-207, 1637-46} (365) Pillet also gave an account of the Fresnel Expedition in CR 1917³²⁹⁻³³⁸ (n. s.) (366). The French public collections of the Louvre resulting from these expeditions and others were described in a new catalogue by Pottier, *Les antiquités assyriennes (Musée du Louvre)*, Paris, 1917 (367). Review by Dussaud RHR 77²⁸⁶⁻²⁸⁸. R. C. Thompson discovered relics

of a neolithic pre-Sumerian civilization at Abu — Shahrein (Eridu). Cf. JAOS 1919¹²⁷⁻¹²⁸ (368). Langdon wrote on the life of *Archibald Henry Sayce* ET 31¹¹⁸⁻¹²³ (369).

TEXTS. Ebeling edited the third section of *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur religioesen Inhalts*, 1917. (370; cf. 226). Since most editors publish now their texts with translations, or at least with introductions, we shall notice them under the topic they illustrate. Original texts were edited by Barton (489), Boissier (427), de la Fuye (432), Grant (433-435), Grice (436), Hussey (419), Keiser (437-438), Langdon (472, 487, 491-492), Lutz (456, 524-525, 537), Maynard (382, 488), Meek (489-490), Nies (440), Pinches (441-470), Scheil (379, 383, 388, 424-425, 444-445, 447-449, 451-452, 457, 480, 484, 493, 504, 507, 520-522, 538, 540), and Thureau-Dangin (412, 454). The question of the kinship of Sumerian to Mongolian languages was again taken up by C. J. Ball, *The relation of Tibetan to Sumerian*. PSBA 40⁹⁵⁻¹⁰⁰ (371). Maynard reviewed Halévy's *Précis d'Allographie*, JSOR 3⁴²⁻⁴⁴.

The study of SIGNS has been simplified by Mercer's very practical *Sumero-Babylonian Sign-List* (372). Cf. review by Maynard JSOR 3⁴⁸⁻⁴⁹. Fossey wrote in JA 1918⁵³³⁻⁵⁴¹ a review of Barton's *Origin and Development of Babylonian Writing*, supplying important corrections. Langdon identified new signs in the first of his *Assyriological notes* RA 15¹⁰⁷⁻¹⁰⁸ (373) and in the fifth (on sign RTC 325), RA 15¹¹³⁻¹¹⁴ (374). Nies wrote on the *Origin of Maš or Bar and the Development of its meaning* JAOS 39⁹¹⁻⁹⁸ (375).

Connected with this topic is the question of the ALPHABET. Luckenbill wrote on *Possible Babylonian Contributions to the so-called Phœnician Alphabet*, AJSL 36²⁷⁻³⁹ (376). Mayer Lambert seems to have reached rather similar conclusions in *L'origine de l'alphabet* JA 1918⁵⁶³⁻⁵⁶⁵ (377). Ronzevalle's article on *Langues et écritures en Israel*, *Recherches de Sciences Religieuses*, 7³⁵³⁻⁴¹⁷ is very important from another point of view.

SYLLABARIES. Pinches reviewed Genouillac's *Vocabulaire . . . d'Ourouk* (RA 1913) in JA 1917³⁵²⁻³⁵⁴, comparing it with a duplicate in the British Museum (378). Scheil edited a *Fragment du Vocabulaire malku* = šarru, RA 14¹⁶⁵⁻¹⁶⁹ (379). A tablet of the same series was edited by Thureau-Dangin with two other fragments as *Un Vocabulaire de Kouyoundjik* RA 16¹⁶⁵⁻¹⁷¹ (380). In one of his

Assyriological Notes RA 15¹⁰⁹⁻¹¹⁰, Langdon studied the fourth tablet of the series ĠARRA = *hubullu* (381). Additional material on that series and the question of the syllabaries in general, was, with Langdon's help, given by Maynard in *A Neo-Babylonian Grammatical School-Text* JSOR 3⁶⁵⁻⁶⁹ (382). Scheil edited a bilingual *Vocabulaire de pierres et d'objets en pierre*, RA 15¹¹⁵⁻¹²⁵ (383).

Materials on SUMERIAN LEXICOGRAPHY is found in many articles. Bearing more especially on the topic are the third and fourth of Langdon's *Four Assyriological Notes* JRAS 1919⁴¹⁻⁴² (384), Lutz's *Two Sumerian Lexicographical Notes*, AJSL 34²⁸⁴ (385), Haupt's *Sumerian ġul-gik, obstinate refusal* JAOS 38⁶⁶⁻⁶⁸ (386), *Aramaic Barra, Wilderness = Sumerian BAR*, JBL 36²⁵⁴⁻²⁵⁵ (387) and Scheil's *Notule* 38 RA 14¹⁶³ which also gives a short Sumerian text.

On the topic of AKKADIAN LEXICOGRAPHY, we have Langdon's *Contribution to Assyrian Lexicography* JSOR 3^{36-41, 81-85} (389), the second of his *Assyriological notes* RA 15¹⁰⁸⁻¹⁰⁹ (on *bagaru*, to have a big belly) (390); another note on *pihu*, vessel, liquid measure, RA 15¹¹²⁻¹¹³ (391); *Lexicographical notes, contribution to the Assyrian Dictionary*, AJSL 34²⁰⁶⁻²⁰⁹ (392), and the second of his *Four Assyriological Notes* (on *apsasu*, wild cattle), JRAS 1917⁴¹ (393); also Haupt, on the *mountain-bull* (or aurochs) = *rimu*, JBL 36²⁴⁹⁻²⁵³ (394) and various lexicographical data scattered in JBL 36²⁵⁵⁻²⁵⁹ 37²⁰⁸⁻²²⁸ 38¹⁵²⁻¹⁵⁶; also Daiches, *Etymological Note* JRAS 1919⁶³⁻⁶⁴, on *epešu* in talmudic (394 a), Siderski, *the Assyrian Word ikdu* (angry, ferocious) AJSL 35²²²⁻²²³ (395), Scheil, *Kunašu et non Kurunna* RA 14¹⁶⁰⁻¹⁶¹ in Weissbach's Wady-Brissa inscription; another *notule* showing that *tamirtum* means pool and giving also two new transliterated Akkadian texts, RA 14¹⁸²⁻¹⁸⁴ (397); *notule* 43, with another Akkadian text given in the same way, shows that *inu-karanu* is "wine," perhaps "sparkling wine" and should be compared with Hebrew *yayin* and Greek *oinos*, RA 14¹⁸⁴⁻¹⁸⁵ (398). *Notule* 50, RA 15¹³⁵⁻¹³⁶ equates *šuranu* and "cat" (399).

Little was done on SUMERIAN GRAMMAR. Langdon's *Sumerian Grammatical Texts* (cf. 22) were reviewed by Fossey, RC 86⁸⁶⁻⁸⁷ and Luckenbill AJTh 22¹⁸⁸⁻¹⁸⁹, Delitzsch's *Kleine Sumerische Sprachlehre* was reviewed by Fossey JA 1918⁵⁴¹⁻⁵⁴³. Haupt wrote on *Tones in Sumerian* JAOS 37³⁰⁹⁻³²³ (400) and Prince on *Phonetic relations in Sumerian* JAOS 39²⁶⁵⁻²⁷⁹ (401).

In the field of AKKADIAN GRAMMAR there was *An Assyrian Grammatical text* by Langdon, PSBA 40¹³³⁻¹³⁴ (402). G. Boson published an elementary textbook for Italian students, *Assiologia, Elementi di grammatica, sillabario, crestomazia e dizionarietto*, Milan 1918, p. xvi + 330 (403). Review by Teloni, RSO 8¹⁶³⁻¹⁶⁷. On comparative grammar, we shall note Mayer Lambert, *Le sémantisme des voyelles en sémitique* JA 1919³⁶⁰⁻³⁶⁴ (404) and Albright, *Notes on Egypto-Semitic Etymology* AJSL 34^{81-98, 215-255} (405).

GEOGRAPHY. O. Schroeder studied *Das Ideogramm der Stadt Arinna* OLZ 20²²⁸⁻²³⁰ (406); F. Macler, *Erzeroum ou topographie de la Haute Arménie*, JA 1919¹⁵³⁻²⁵⁷ (407); M. Streck, *Seleucia und Ktesiphon*, Der Alte Orient, 16, 3-4 (408). Olmstead gave us four maps in his article on Ashur-nasir-apal. (cf. 430). Scheil published a transliterated Sumerian text which shows that the lands of Susa and Elam were distinguished one from the other, in the times of the kings of Ur, RA 14¹⁸¹⁻¹⁸² (409). Langdon showed in *Babylon and the Land Beyond the River* ET 30⁴⁶¹⁻⁴⁶³ that Syria is the Land Beyond the River, an expression found even in a late Minæan inscription (410). Among the many books of little interest to Assyriologists written by officers of the British Army in Mesopotamia we shall single for the quality of its water colors, Martin Swayne, *In Mesopotamia* 1917 (411).

Two important monographs on Chronology were published. The first is Thureau-Dangin's *La chronologie des dynasties de Sumer et d'Accad* (412). The first part which had already appeared in RA 15¹⁻⁵⁷, includes the text of a new Sumerian prism which, when whole, gave the chronology of the whole Larsa dynasty. The editor restored a good deal of the missing parts with dates given by business documents, some of these being still unpublished. Cf. reviews by Mercer, JSOR 3⁹⁷⁻⁹⁸ and Langdon, AJSL 35²²³⁻²²⁹. The other is E. F. Weidner's *Studien zur assyrisch-babylonischen Chronologie und Geschichte auf Grund neuer Funde* MVAG 20 1915, 4, Hinrichs 1917 (413) where seven texts found in Assur are given in transliteration. Weidner wrote also a more popular article on *Neue Koenigslisten aus Assur*, MDOG No. 58 Aug. 1917¹⁻²¹ (414). See also Meissner's *Synchronismen* OLZ 20²²⁵⁻²²⁸ (415). Sidersky's *Etude sur la chronologie assyro-babylonienne* (cf. 80) was reviewed by Luckenbill AJTh 22¹⁴⁰⁻¹⁴¹. There are some new dates in E. M. Grice's *Records*

from *Ur and Larsa* (cf. 436) and Keiser's *Selected Temple Documents* (cf. 438). A tablet of the Museum of Laval, France, transliterated by Scheil, RA 15¹³⁸⁻¹³⁹, shows that the year *En-ga-aš-(ki) ba-hun* is the ninth of Bur-Sin (416). Lutz proposed a new manner of Reading of the Date-Formula of the Fourth Year of Gimil-Sin JAOS 37³³⁰⁻³³¹ (417). Langdon wrote on *Rim-Sin, A contemporary of Samsu-iluna*, PSBA 40¹³¹⁻¹³³ (418).

HISTORY. M. I. Hussey edited *A Galet of Eannatum*, JAOS 38²⁶⁴⁻²⁶⁶, a variant of galet E (419). Langdon transliterated another *Sin-gašid* cone from the Toledo collection (cf. 439). Writing about Pinches study of the Relph Collection (cf. 162 and 441), Sayce took up again the question of *The Arioch of Genesis*, PSBA 40⁹² (420). Pinches wrote on the same topic, under the same title, PSBA 40¹¹³⁻¹¹⁴ (421). Sayce gave us some *Additional notes on the Sargon text*, PSBA 40¹⁵ (422; cf. 108). Barton's note *On the Identification of a portrait statue of a Babylonian King*, AJSL 34²⁰⁴⁻²⁰⁶, declares a piece of sculpture of Bismya to be a likeness of Shargalisharri (423). Scheil edited *Un dépôt de fondation de Erišum*, RA 15¹⁴¹⁻¹⁴² (424). Johns studied *An overlooked fragment of the Dynastic Chronicle* PSBA 40¹²⁵⁻¹³⁰ (424 a). Scheil edited a *Fragment d'une inscription de Salmanasar fils d'Assurnasirpal* RA 14¹⁵⁹⁻¹⁶⁰ (425). Johns studied *A religious foundation of Ašurbanipal's*, PSBA 40¹¹⁷⁻¹²⁵ (426). Boissier edited a new *Inscription de Narâm-Sin*, RA 16¹⁵⁷⁻¹⁶⁴ (427). Langdon's article on Babylon and the Land Beyond the River (cf. 410) includes a translation of Text 169 in Keiser's *Letters and Contracts from Erech* (cf. 438) which sheds interesting light on Gobryas. Scheil's transliteration of a contract of the time of Assurbanipal RA 15⁸¹⁻⁸² gives us through an interesting *lapsus calami* of a scribe the name of an *Aššur-epuš* which one less wary than Scheil would have taken for a new Achæmenidian prince (428). In an article which continues our Nr 95, Olmstead studied *The Babylonian Empire*, from Utu-hegal to Sin-gashid, AJSL 35⁶⁵⁻¹⁰⁰ (429). He wrote also on *The Calculated frightfulness of Ashurnasirpal* JAOS 38²⁰⁹⁻²⁶³ (430) and a masterful sketch of *Oriental Imperialism*, *American Historical Review*, 1918⁷⁵⁵⁻⁷⁶² (431).

BUSINESS DOCUMENTS. A. de la Fuye edited a *Compte de gestion d'un entrepôt de matériaux à Tummaal*, which gives us a fine knowledge of the ledger system of a Sumerian storehouse of the

Ur dynasty (432). E. Grant edited *Cuneiform documents in the Smith College Library* (433). Reviews by Mercer JSOR 2⁹⁰, and Pinches JRAS 1918⁶³¹⁻⁶³³ 1919⁶⁴.

Grant edited also *A First Dynasty Legal Settlement*, AJSL 34¹³⁵⁻¹³⁷ which bears on family rights (434) and a text on *Balmunamge the slave dealer* AJSL 34¹⁹⁹⁻²⁰⁴, important for the legal status of slaves (435). The fifth volume of Babylonian Texts of the Yale Oriental Series is made up of *Records from Ur and Larsa dated in the Larsa Dynasty*, 1919, by E. M. Grice (436). Keiser gave us a volume of *Letters and Contracts from Erech written in the Neo-Babylonian period* (437). Review by Maynard, JSOR 3⁹⁵⁻⁹⁶ and by Mercer, Harvard Theol. Rev. 1919⁴⁸³⁻⁴⁸⁴. See also Langdon's article noted above (cf. 410, and in historical section, after 427; also Scheil's *notule*, cf. 450). Keiser also edited the fourth volume of the Yale Oriental Series being *Selected Temple Documents of the Ur Dynasty* (438). Langdon edited a Sumerian receipt for grain in his study of the *Toledo Collection of Cuneiform Tablets*, AJSL 34¹²³⁻¹²⁸ (439). J. B. Nies published *A Pre-Sargonic Inscription on Limestone from Warka*, JAOS 38¹⁸⁸⁻¹⁹⁶ (440). Pinches completed his study of the Relph collection PSBA 39⁸⁹⁻⁹⁸ (441. Cf. 162). Scheil gave in transliteration an *Acte d'affranchissement du temps d'Ellil-bani*, RA 14¹⁵¹⁻¹⁵³ (442) and the deed of a *Vente d'une vache et de son veau*, RA 14¹⁵³⁻¹⁵⁴ (443). He edited a text on *Prêt et caution*, RA 14¹⁵⁴⁻¹⁵⁶ 15⁸⁶ (444). His *Notule* 34 is on a text bearing on storage of goods, *Une affaire de dépôt*, RA 14¹⁵⁶⁻¹⁵⁹ (445). *Notule* 45, RA 15⁸⁰⁻⁸¹ studies the new expression NU-HA-SA-SI in a transliterated business document (446). *Notule* 46, RA 15⁸²⁻⁸³ gives us with a new text, an interesting formula of business solidarity, "I take thy bread with thy drink." (447). *Notule* 53, RA 15¹³⁹⁻¹⁴¹, is a new text of the Hammurabi period on a *Litige causé par la coïncidence du rachat et de la mort d'une esclave* (448). Another new text, RA 16¹¹¹⁻¹¹² is about a loan of barley with an Aramaic docket, dated in the time of Darius II (449). *Notule* 58, RA 16¹¹³⁻¹¹⁴ transliterates text 169 in Keyser's Letters and Contracts (cf. 437) which is a *Procès-verbal d'un refus d'obéissance* (450). Scheil gave us also a study *Sur le marché aux poissons de Larsa*, RA 15¹⁸³⁻¹⁹⁴ with some new texts showing the great importance of the fish industry, and the great varieties of fishes offered for sale (451). He also edited two Akka-

dian documents of great legal importance in his *Tablettes de Ker-kouk* RA 15⁶⁵⁻⁷³ (452).

LAW. Langdon touched on Sumerian law in his Contributions to Assyrian Lexicography already noticed (JSOR 3⁸²⁻⁸³) (cf. 389) and improved the translation of a difficult passage in the Epilogue of the Code of Hammurabi JSOR 3⁸³⁻⁸⁵. Poebel's fragment of the Code was studied by Cuq, *Les nouveaux fragments du Code de Hammourabi sur le prêt à intérêt et les sociétés*, Paris, 1918, a reprint from the *Memoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres*, vol. 41 (453). Review by Fossey RC 1919²⁰¹⁻²⁰³ with some criticism of Scheil's translation which was followed by Cuq. In *Un acte de donation de Marduk-zakir-sumi*, RA 16¹¹⁷⁻¹⁵⁶, Thureau-Dangin showed the so-called boundary-stones were engrossed copies of a deed which had a votive rather than a legal value. He also gave there a translation of the kudurru of Nabu-sum-iškun and contributed data bearing on religion (454). In one of his Assyriological Notes, PSBA 39²¹¹ Sayce touched on the *Hittite Code of Laws* (455). Linfield studied *The Relation of Jewish to Babylonian Law* AJSL 36⁴⁰⁻⁶⁶ (456).

LETTERS. We have already noticed Keiser's *Letters and Contracts from Erech* (cf. 437). Lutz edited *Early Babylonian Letters from Larsa* (456) which were reviewed by Mercer JSOR 2⁸⁹⁻⁹⁰, Luckenbill AJSL 35¹⁶⁰, and Waterman AJTh 1919¹²⁶⁻¹²⁷. Another letter from Larsa was edited by Scheil RA 15⁶¹⁻⁶⁴ on *L'admission d'un esclave au service liturgique* (457). *The Date of the Tel Amarna Tablets* was studied by Hollingworth PSBA 40¹⁰⁰⁻¹⁰³ (458). *A difficult passage in an Amarna Letter* is explained by Luckenbill AJSL 35¹⁵⁸⁻¹⁵⁹ as an instance of horseplay with foreigners (459). Langdon edited a Neo-Babylonian Letter in his study of the Toledo Collection noticed under No. 439. The Excavations at Assur produced six clay tablets written in Aramaic. Cf. Lidzbarski, *Ein Aramaeischer Brief aus der Zeit Ašurbanipals* MDOG 1917⁵⁰⁻⁵² (460).

CIVILIZATION. Dr. Contenau has specialized in the study of Umma (cf. 165-168). His latest book is on *Umma sous la dynastie d'Ur*, Paris, 1916 (461). Reviews by Pinches JRAS 1918¹³²⁻¹³⁴ and Fossey RC 1919²⁰⁸⁻²⁰⁴. A study of basic importance is that of W. Schwenzner, *Zum Altbabylonischen Wirtschaftsleben Studien über*

Wirtschaftsbetrieb Preise, Darlehen und Agrarverhaeltnisse, MVAG 1914, 3, Hinrichs 1915 where the market value of many goods is investigated (462). Lutz called attention to an unnoticed moveable visor on the *helmet of Eannatum* (Stele des Vautours) JAOS 38⁶⁸⁻⁶⁹ (463). Gilgamesh's pointed boots, as they are worn to-day in Kurdistan, were studied by Scheil on seals RA 15⁸⁴⁻⁸⁵ (464). On the question of wines, we had besides Scheil's *notule* noticed under Nr 398, an article of W. Schwenzner on *Geštin-x-aš* OLZ 1917²³⁰⁻²³² (465). Scheil showed in RA 15¹⁴³⁻¹⁴⁴ that the protective curses at the end of documents used at first by kings (*pour la police des bibliothèques*) were used later by private individuals (466). Sayce's brief article on *The Cappadocian tablets in Philadelphia*, MJ 1918¹⁴³⁻¹⁵⁰ called attention to the spread of Sumerian civilization circa 2500 B.C. (467).

NAMES. Clay's *Personal Names* 1912, were reviewed by Fossey JA 1918⁵⁴³⁻⁵⁴⁴. Chiera's *List of Personal Names* (cf. 217) was reviewed by Luckenbill AJTh 22¹³⁶⁻¹³³. In Scheil's Tablets of Kerkouk noticed under Nr 452 we find an index of proper names which are mostly of Guti, RA 15⁷²⁻⁷³. Lidzbarski article (cf. 460) gives Aramaic transliterations of proper names. Of great value are the indices in Grice's (cf. 436) and Keyser's (cf. 437-438) books.

MYTHS. Geller's book on the series *Lugal-e* (cf. 241) was reviewed by Langdon RA 15²⁰⁰⁻²¹⁵ who offered many corrections. J. W. Rothstein argued against an Egyptian Nimrod OLZ 1917²⁴⁹⁻²⁵⁰ (468). Barton edited texts of a mythological nature in his *Miscellaneous Babylonian Inscriptions* 1918 (469). Review by Mercer JSOR 3⁴⁴⁻⁴⁶. The fourth of these texts was studied again by Pinches, *The Legend of the Divine Lovers, Enlil and Ninlil*, JRAS 1919¹⁸⁵⁻²⁰⁵ with a new bilingual text (470). Langdon's epic continues to attract attention. In January 1920 it has again been taken up by the editorial page of the *New York Herald*. Together with the rest of PBS X, it was circumspectly reviewed by Luckenbill AJTh 1919¹⁰³⁻¹⁰⁴. Langdon defended his point of view on *The Gardener of the Epic of Paradise* ET 29²¹⁸⁻²²¹ (471). He gave a better edition of the text in *Le poème sumérien du Paradis, du Déluge et de la Chute de l'homme*, transl. by Virolleaud, 1919. (472). Review by Mercer JSOR 3⁸⁶⁻⁸⁸. In the first of his *Four Assyriological Notes* JRAS 1919³⁷⁻⁴¹ (473), Langdon defended his reading TAG-TUG (fuller)

without rejecting the reading Uttu which had been given by Scheil in a notule RA 15¹⁹⁵⁻¹⁹⁶ (474). Waterman wrote on *The Curse in the Paradise Epic* JAOS 39³²²⁻³²⁸ seeing in the epic a mythical story of the colonization of the lowlands of the Euphrates by the highlanders now called Sumerians (475). Albright wrote on *Some cruces in the Langdon Epic* JAOS 39⁶⁵⁻⁹⁰ taking up at the same time the Assur recension of the Descent of Ishtar (cf. 238) in which he saw an astral myth (476). Another article by Albright on *The mouth of the Rivers* AJSL 35¹⁶¹⁻¹⁹⁵ deals with the tree of life and the four rivers of Paradise (477). Miss C. Garlick in a *Note on the Sacred Tree in Mesopotamia* rediscovered that it was a palm tree, PSBA 40¹¹¹⁻¹¹² (477 a).

Langdon's new fragment of the Epic of Gilgamesh (cf. 231) was reviewed by Fossey RC 1919⁸³⁻⁸⁵. We already noticed Scheil's notule on the hero's boots (cf. 464). There is another notule *Sur les deux songes de Gilgamesh* (in Langdon's text) RA 16¹¹⁴⁻¹¹⁵ (478). Albright's article on *The Babylonian sage ut-napištu-râqu* JAOS 38⁶⁰⁻⁶⁵ takes us from mythology proper into the field of Babylonian literature of Wisdom (479).

Le poème d'Agušaya edited by Scheil, RA 15¹⁶⁹⁻¹⁸² (480) is the work of Hammurabi himself. Zimmern's text on *Šaltu* (cf. 240) was only a part of it.

Lutz's article on *The DD Emblem of Osiris* JAOS 39¹⁹⁶⁻²⁰⁵ sheds interesting side lights on Babylonian mythology (481).

There is a general treatment of the myths in L. W. King's Schweich Lectures for 1916 (*Legends of Babylon and Egypt in relation to Hebrew Tradition*, London 1918) (482). Reviews by Loisy RC 1919¹⁶¹⁻¹⁶⁵, J. M. P. Smith AJTh 1919³⁶⁷⁻³⁶⁸. Dhorme has begun a survey of mythology in *Les traditions babyloniennes sur les origines* RB 1919³⁶⁰⁻³⁷¹ (to be continued) (483).

In LITERATURE proper, besides the mythological poems mentioned above we note a *Fragment d'épopée*, edited by Scheil RA 15¹³⁶⁻¹³⁷ (484), and fables and a philosophical text similar to Koheleth, edited by Ebeling in his KAR 3 (cf. 370).

RELIGIOUS TEXTS. Besides Ebeling's text just mentioned, on which he wrote a popular account in *Aus den Keilschrifttexten aus Assur religioesen Inhalts* MDOG, Nr 58 1917²²⁻⁵⁰ (485) and *Quellen zur Kenntnis der Babylonischen Religion* MVAG 23 1918, 1 (486),

we had a number of new texts: *Three New hymns in the cults of Deified Kings*, edited by Langdon PSBA 40^{30-40, 45-56, 60-85} (487); *A Lamentation to Aruru*, edited by Maynard, JSOR 3¹⁴⁻¹⁸ (488); *Some Bilingual Texts*, by Meek AJSL 35¹³⁴⁻¹⁴⁴ (489); *A votive Inscription of Ashurbanipal* JAOS 38¹⁶⁷⁻¹⁷⁵ edited also by Meek (490). Langdon edited *A hymn to the Moon-God adapted for the use of Shamash-shum-ukin* PSBA 40¹⁰⁴⁻¹¹⁰ (491) and *The religious interpretation of Babylonian seals and a new prayer of Shamash-shum-ukin* RA 16⁴⁹⁻⁶⁸ (492) with important notes on the šu-illa liturgies. Scheil edited an (Akkadian) *Fragment du rituel pour la restauration d' un édifice* RA 14¹⁷⁷⁻¹⁸⁰ (493) Langdon's Sumerian Liturgical Tests, 1917 (cf. 229) were reviewed by Fossey RC 86⁸²⁻⁸³. Langdon gave a popular account of an *Ode to the Word* in MJ 1918¹⁵⁷⁻¹⁶³ (494).

RELIGION. Scheil showed that *Anuṣaltum* is a better reading than *Anunitum* RA 14¹⁶²⁻¹⁶³ (495), an hypothesis made more secure by his *Agušaya* text (cf. 480). Fossey criticized Hommel's theory of the goddess Esh-ghanna, JA 1918⁵⁴⁵⁻⁵⁴⁶. Clay maintained that the *Name of the so-called deity Za-mal-mal* is Za-bà-bà, JAOS 37³²⁸⁻³²⁹ (496); but that was rejected by Luckenbill, together with the readings Urta and Anuṣat in his articles *On the reading of the names of some Babylonian gods* AJSL 35⁵⁵⁻⁶¹ (497). Albright wrote on *Ninib-Ninurta* JAOS 38¹⁹⁷⁻²⁰¹ (498) and Johns on the *Queen of Heaven*, ERE 10⁵³²⁻⁵³³ (499); Sayce on the Hamathite God אֱלֹהִי, *iln Wir*, PSBA 39²⁰⁸ (500), on the *Pig-God* 39²⁰⁹ (501), on the name of the God Ea (as AE), 39²¹¹⁻²¹² (502), on the *Babylonian name of Nin-ip* as An-usta 39²¹² (503). Scheil edited a *Liste de dieux et temples assyriens* RA 14¹⁷¹⁻¹⁷⁶ where we have 15 of the 17 gods worshipped in the temple of the Assyrian Ishtar (504).

On the question of symbolism in worship, we have Scheil's *notule* on the solar disk-emblems *šamšati et samsati* RA 14¹⁸⁰⁻¹⁸¹ with a Sumerian text in transliteration (505); Langdon's article on *Babylonian symbolism in the Cassite period* MJ 1918¹⁵¹⁻¹⁵⁶ (506), Scheil's article on *La déesse Nina et ses poissons*, RA 15¹²⁷⁻¹⁵⁴, with a Sumerian Psalm to Nina and a discussion of the iconography of fish-symbolism (507); and Toscanne's study of kudurru and seals bearing *sur la figuration et le symbole du scorpion* RA 14¹⁸⁷⁻²⁰³, a valuable study of Ishtar-symbolism.

Priest and *Priesthood* were studied by Pinches ERE 10²⁸⁴⁻²⁸⁸ (509). See also Scheil's text on the admission of a slave to liturgical service (cf. 457) which is accompanied by the transliteration of an Ur tablet giving the share of a booty of slaves given to the god Shara — and in an article of Thureau-Dangin already noticed (cf. 454) a very important text on the *kalu* and a discussion on music. Langdon wrote on *Prayer* ERE 10¹⁵⁹⁻¹⁶⁶ (510), Johns on *Purification* ERE 10⁴⁶⁶⁻⁴⁶⁸ (511), Pinches on the *Babylonian Sabbath* ERE 10⁸⁸⁹⁻⁸⁹¹ (512) and on *Pilgrimage* ERE 10¹²⁻¹³ (513); Morgenstern appended a remark on the kindling of sacred fires in Semitic religions to Nies' article on Maš (cf. 375); Barton wrote on *Possession* ERE 10¹³³⁻¹³⁴ (514). Langdon's article on *The Babylonian Conception of the Logos* JRAS 1918⁴³³⁻⁴⁴⁹ brings up an interesting comparison with Ionian philosophy (515). Pinches wrote also on *Righteousness* ERE 10⁷⁷⁷⁻⁷⁷⁸ (516). An outline of the religion was written by Jastrow in *Religions of the Past and Present*, edited by J. A. Montgomery 1918 (517). Cf. reviews by Mercer JSOR 2⁹⁴ and Maynard ATR 1⁴²⁹. Mercer wrote an excellent textbook on *Religious and moral ideas in Babylonia and Assyria* 1919. He continued his article on Sumerian morals (cf. 132) by one on *Early Babylonian morals* JSOR 2⁵⁵⁻⁷⁵ (519). His book on the *Oath in Babylonian and Assyrian Literatures* 1912, was reviewed by Fossey, JA 1918⁵⁴⁵.

DIVINATION. Scheil published three new astrological texts, *Un fragment susien du livre Enuma eliš* RA 14¹³⁹⁻¹⁴² (520) 28 *présages tirés de Venus* RA 14¹⁴²⁻¹⁴⁵ (521), *Deux rapports d'augures* RA 14¹⁴⁵⁻¹⁵¹ (522). Pinches wrote on *Assyro-Babylonians and their Lore* ET 30¹⁶⁴⁻¹⁶⁸ (523). Lutz edited *A Cassite Liver Omen Text* JAOS 38⁷⁷⁻⁹⁶ (524) and *An Omen text referring to the action of a Dreamer* AJSL 35¹⁴⁵⁻¹⁵⁷ with a short introduction on oneiromancy (525).

MATHEMATICS AND ASTRONOMY. In the fourth of his Assyriological Notes RA 15¹¹⁰⁻¹¹², Langdon gave us some *Mathematical Observations on the Scheil-Esagila Tablet* (526). Sidersky took up *Le calcul chaldéen des néoménies* RA 16²¹⁻³⁶ which superseded direct observation in the third century B.C. and later was adopted by the Sanhedrin (527). Langdon wrote an important review of Landsberger's *Kultische Kalendar* (cf. 329).

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES. Thureau-Dangin's *Note métrologique* RA 15⁵⁹⁻⁶⁰ discusses the new measure *ammāt-ara-e* found by Scheil

(528). Scheil studied the measure *giš BA-AN* RA 15⁸⁵⁻⁸⁶ (529). We already noticed Langdon's remark on *pihu* (cf. 391). The question of *the Babylonian Measures of capacity* was brought up to date by Johns PSBA 40¹³⁶⁻¹⁴⁰ (530).

HISTORY OF ART. Contenau wrote *La question des origines comparées* RA 15⁹⁵⁻¹⁰⁶ (531) and *Les Hittites, l'Orient, la Grèce* RA 16⁹⁷⁻¹⁰⁶ (532).

CYLINDER-SEALS. Besides Contenau's first article (cf. 531) and articles by Scheil (cf. 464) and Langdon (cf. 492) already noticed, we had, by Scheil, *Nouvelles notes d'épigraphie et d'archéologie assyriennes* RT 1917¹⁶⁵⁻¹⁷⁴ (533); *Cylindres et légendes inédits*, RA 14¹³³⁻¹³⁸ (534) and RA 16¹⁰⁷⁻¹¹⁰ (535). We shall note Langdon's translation of *Inscriptions on Cassite seals* RA 16⁸⁹⁻⁹⁵ (536) and the interesting instance of a temporary seal with two brothers' names together in one of Scheil's articles (cf. 446).

MEDICINE. Lutz edited a new text dealing with diseases of the genital organs, *A contribution to the knowledge of Assyro-Babylonian Medicine* AJSL 36⁶⁷⁻⁸³ (537). Scheil's new *Tablette de pronostics médicaux* RA 14¹²¹⁻¹³¹ refers to an unknown disease (538). F. Von Oefele wrote on *Ascalabotes fascicularis* in *Old Babylonian Medicine* (539) showing how the gecko (MIR, *igigu*) was a therapeutic ingredient, JAOS 39²⁸⁴⁻²⁸⁵ (539). Scheil edited *Quelques remèdes pour les yeux* RA 15⁷⁵⁻⁸⁰ (540). Von Oefele also wrote on *The Assyrian Veterinary Physician* JAOS 37⁵³¹⁻⁵³² (541).

ZOOLOGY. Besides Von Oefele's note on the gecko (cf. 539), we had his article on *A Babylonian representation of a jumping-mouse* JAOS 38¹⁴⁰ (542); some discussion on the *ailu* and the deer in Ashurbanipal's hunting scenes by Benedite in his article on the Carnarvon Ivory, *Journ. of Egyptian Archaeology* 1918¹²⁻¹³ (543); and notes already mentioned by Scheil (399), Haupt (394), and Langdon (393).

LIGHT ON THE BIBLE. On this subject much could be gleaned in many of the articles noticed above. We shall recall especially King on the Legends (482), Luckenbill on horseplay on foreigners (459) Sayce and Pinches on Arioch (420-421), Grice's mention of the Habiri in her records from Ur (436), Sayce's *Assyriological Notes* PSBA 39²⁰⁷⁻²¹², some of which have already been noticed (500-503), (the others bear on the Cherubim, Baal and Yahweh, the Ephod,

gopher-wood, imperial purple and the shew-bread) (545). Let us recall also John's article on the Queen of Heaven (cf. 499).

Bearing on the Hebrew Language, we have Delitzsch's *Philologische Forderungen an die Hebräische Lexicographie* MVAG 1915, 5, Hinrichs, 1917 (546), Haupt's notes on *dagâlu*, to look for, in the Old Testament JBL 37²²⁹⁻²³² (547), *tora-tahrirtu* JBL 36²⁵⁸⁻²⁵⁹ (548), *tamertu* and *teruma* JSOR 2⁸⁷ (549), Montgomery's note on *Babylonian niš oath*, in *West Semitic* JAOS 37³²⁹⁻³³⁰ (550), Albright's *Etymology of Se'ol* AJSL 34²⁰⁹⁻²¹⁰ (551).

Obbink wrote on the Paradise story. Cf. Mercer in JSOR 3⁵⁰ (552). Barton treated of *A New Babylonian Parallel to a part of Genesis*, a rather forced parallelism between the episode of hierodule clothing Engidu with that of the clothing of Adam and Eve, JAOS 39²⁸⁷ (553). Bewer wrote on *Ancient Babylonian parallels to the prophecies of Haggai* AJSL 35¹²⁸⁻¹³³ (554). Jastrow compared Eccles. 9⁷⁻⁹ with Gilgamesh, *A gentle Cynic* 1919¹⁷²⁻¹⁷⁵. Langdon told us about *The release of a prisoner at the Passover* of similar rites of symbolic magic by the Babylonian king ET 39³²⁸⁻³³⁰ (555) an article which may give new life to a much discussed argument of Frazer.

THE "EYE OF HORUS" IN THE PYRAMID TEXTS

By SAMUEL A. B. MERCER, Western Theological Seminary, Chicago

AMONG the earliest phenomena personified by the ancient Egyptians was the sky. It was deified and was known as the goddess Nut. Her two eyes were the sun and the moon, the more important being the former, which in turn was personified as the god Rā. Rā soon became so powerful and influential that the whole heavens were considered merely the background, and the two eyes of Nut became Rā's two eyes. The sun, or right eye, remained the more important and Rā was usually considered *the* eye of heaven. So the eye of the Rā was Rā himself.¹

According as theologians developed a pantheon so gods were brought into relationship with one another. Among the early Egyptian gods Rā took a very prominent place, and his great power resided in his eye. From the water of the pupil of his eye issued other gods, and in time the eye itself was personified and considered a deity. The Egyptian word for eye, *yr-t*, is feminine, so the eye assumed a feminine personification. In Egypt the power of the heat of Rā's eye dispelled storms and rain and dispersed the clouds,² but in foreign lands the same power scorched and burned up the foe. As a hostile burning power the eye of Rā was personified as the goddess Hathor, who was believed to be the daughter of the sun-god. In desert districts, especially in Nubia, the same eye was personified as Tefnut, the wild blood-thirsty daughter of Rā. The eye was also personified as the fire-goddess Satis, as the goddesses Bast and Sekhet, and as the uraeus snake. All these deities arose in southern Egypt and Nubia where the eye of Rā was wont to destroy the enemies of Egypt.³

¹ This holds true even in Ptolemaic times when Chons, the moon god, was referred to as the eye of Rā, for Chons was considered the night sun.

² PT 500. In further references in this article PT (Sethe, *Die altaegyptischen Pyramidentexte*) will be omitted from the numbers of the sections.

³ For details about the "Eye of Rā" see K. Sethe, *Zur altaegyptischen Sage vom Sonnenauge das in der Fremde war*, Leipzig, 1912. The watery matter of the eye of Rā was personified as the goddess Meh-wrt.

Now Hathor, the daughter of Rā, and his fiery eye, became the mother of Horus.⁴ That is, Horus, who was originally a local god, became later the chief god of Lower Egypt, and, as such, was brought into relationship with Rā, as a solar deity. Because of a similarity between the sound of Horus' name and that of the word for face (*ḥr*), Horus was regarded as the face of the heavens. He, therefore, in time became identified with Rā, who had become identified with the sky goddess Nut. It was then Horus' two eyes that brightened the two lands, for the two eyes were the sun by day and the moon by night and the term "eyes of Horus" was applied to the sun and moon. But just as in the case of Rā, although the two eyes of Horus are often referred to in the Pyramid Texts,⁵ it is the "Eye of Horus" which played such an important rôle in the religious ideas of the Pyramid age.⁶

Another step will bring us to the heart of our subject. At an early date in the development of Egyptian religious ideas the water- and vegetation-god Osiris became very popular and powerful, and in many respects usurped the place of Rā. The result was that Horus became the son of Osiris. Now, in a conflict between Horus and Set in the interest of Osiris, Horus was wounded by Set and lost his eye.⁷ Horus' sacrifice of his eye for his father Osiris became symbolical of all sacrifices, and the Horus-eye became one of the holiest symbols of the Egyptian religion. Except the scarab the Horus-eye is the commonest symbol known to ancient Egypt. But, by a strange mixture of myths, it was not the left eye (that is, the moon) of Horus that became the powerful symbol of sacrifice, but the right eye, that is, the sun. This followed from the fact that Horus became the son of Osiris, who had usurped the place of Rā, and so the theology of Horus was bound up with the sun-god, Rā, the right eye of the heavens. The famous "Eye of Horus," then, must be, as a rule, regarded as solar and not lunar.

⁴ The word Hathor (*ḥt ḥr*) means, house of Horus.

⁵ E.g. 33, 69-71, 96, 103, 108, 583, 1240, etc., the one white and the other black (33), or the one white and the other green (96, 108).

⁶ The left, which is sometimes called the "large left eye" (451, 453) is the moon (1231), the right being the sun, or Rā.

⁷ This is a cosmic feature, referring to a lunar eclipse (1207 c, d), for it was the left eye that was taken. Thoth, the moon-god healed it by spitting upon it, and returned it.

Just as in the Western part of the Catholic Church the word "Mass," which does not mean sacrifice at all, came to be used almost entirely for the official sacrifice, so in ancient Egypt the term "Eye of Horus" was used almost exclusively for sacrifice.⁸ But there is this difference in the use of the two liturgical terms, that while the term "Mass" is used only in reference to the complete service of sacrifice, the term "Eye of Horus" was mainly used in reference to the material which constituted the *res* of the sacrifice. Thus, the "Eye of Horus" was, the bread (844), the wine⁹ (36), the fruit (95), the barley (97), the grain (109), the water (10), the olive oil (54), the beer (39), the butter or cheese (31), the goose (85), the meat (84), the dove (86), the milk (61), the incense (283), the natron (72), the cosmetic (54), the linen (1755), every sweet thing (100, 111), etc. In short, the term was used for any gift to be offered in sacrifice.¹⁰

Every sacrifice was an "Eye of Horus," and the "Eye of Horus" was Horus himself. Therefore, the offering is the god himself being offered on behalf of the deceased in order to open his mouth,¹¹ and to enable him to become a soul (*ba*).¹²

Now, since the "Eye of Horus" is Horus himself — the part for the whole —, therefore, Horus dwells in the deceased¹³ and becomes the deceased,¹⁴ enabling him, in the words of a later text, to "become the blazing Eye of Horus."¹⁵ But the deceased becomes an Osiris,¹⁶ and just as Horus ministered to his father Osiris, so he fills the deceased with his eye.¹⁷

Of course, the deceased in the Pyramid Texts is always the king. And when it is said that the "Eye of Horus" becomes the deceased, it means that the "Eye of Horus" becomes the king. But the king was the head of the state and symbolized it, and when the term "Eye of Horus" was applied to the king, it was also liable to be

⁸ E.g. 19, 20, 29, 31, 35-36, 60, 64, 78.

⁹ See Brugsch, Wörterbuch, *ar-hor*, p. 103 and supplement pp. 106-114.

¹⁰ In 1277 it seems that the term was applied to the king's pyramid and mortuary temple, they being considered an offering to the dead king.

¹¹ See 39, 63, 92 etc.

¹² See 139, 579, 2075.

¹³ E.g. 19, 21, 55, 831.

¹⁴ E.g. 698, 976, 1147. A part for the whole appears in 830 where the "Eye of Horus" is said to be the head of the king.

¹⁵ P. Lacau, *Textes Religieux égyptiens*, Paris, 1910, LXXX.

¹⁶ E.g. 578.

¹⁷ E.g. 21, 114.

applied to the country also. Thus, the land of Egypt was called the "Eye of Horus,"¹⁸ and so Horus was said to have built his eye, that is, Egypt.¹⁹ In like manner, because the White and the Red crowns represented Upper and Lower Egypt respectively, so the White and the Red crowns were spoken of as the eyes of Horus;²⁰ and as Upper and Lower Egypt were symbolized by two serpents — the goddesses Nechbat and Buto — so the eyes of Horus were considered serpents of the king,²¹ and the "Eye of Horus" as a serpent.²²

The process of personification went still further. So usual was it to make offerings for the deceased, that they came to be considered necessary for the king's protection, and hence protectors of the king,²³ and the power by which he was enabled to operate.²⁴ This power was personified, just as the post-exilic Jews personified the Torah. Thus, the "Eye of Horus" is conceived,²⁵ it is born every day,²⁶ it lives and addresses the king,²⁷ it avenges the king and sits before him as his god,²⁸ and it has parts and qualities just as any other personality.²⁹ In short, the "Eye of Horus" acquired such a reputation that to it were ascribed peculiar strength, vigour, protective power, and safety, the rays of whose light nourished the spirits of heaven and created things and beings.

It later became quite the fashion to ascribe the attribute of a powerful "Eye" to other gods, such as, Nu, Tem, Ptaḥ-Tenen, Amon-Rā, etc.; and the hypocephalus as the "Eye of Horus" became all powerful as a source of magic, and as an amulet.

In short, the term "Eye of Horus" was a liturgical phrase which indicated a sacrifice; or anything that was construed sacrificially, such as Horus himself, the deceased, the king, Egypt, or the protectors of the king; or any material used in a sacrificial act.

¹⁸ E.g. 1587-96.

¹⁹ E.g. 1589.

²⁰ E.g. 1459-1460; cf. 261, 742, 1795. Sometimes instead of white (*ḥd. t*) and red (*dšr. t*), the terms green (*wad. t*) and black (*km. t*) are used in the same connection, e.g., 33, 96, 901. Hence, offerings were called "the White Eye of Horus," and "the Green Eye of Horus."

²¹ E.g. 1287.

²² E.g. 1456.

²³ E.g. 20.

²⁴ E.g. 51.

²⁵ E.g. 698. In 1832 it is said that it came forth from the head of the divine king, just as Athena sprang forth from the head of Zeus.

²⁶ E.g. 698.

²⁷ E.g. 2050, 758.

²⁸ E.g. 67, 57.

²⁹ E.g. 2090, 976, 451, 2072.

CONTRIBUTION TO ASSYRIAN LEXICOGRAPHY

By STEPHEN LANGDON, Oxford University

10. The compound preposition and adverb *murgu-ta*.

THE interesting Neo-Babylonian vocabulary recently published by PROFESSOR SCHEIL¹ at line 70 has the important entry:—

murgu = *arkatu*, afterward, past.

The sign *murgu* is BRÜNNOW, 11191 and commonly denotes *pûdu*, *ešen šîru*, back, spine. Names of parts of the body frequently serve as prepositions and it is not unexpected that this word *murgu*, back, served as a preposition for "after," when compounded with the postfix *ta*. The Scheil Vocabulary, in fact, enables us to explain a difficult matter in Sumerian grammar. In all the known texts where this phrase occurs the sign *MURGU* is falsely written *LUM*, *HUM*, a fact which has prevented the true interpretation. I call attention first to the legal document, THUREAU-DANGIN, *Recueil de Tablettes Chaldéennes* 290, 9:—

*murgu*² *ba-gur-ra-ta*, "After she had lodged a complaint."

Note also the following passages:—

*murgu*² *in-tak-a-ta*, "After he had divorced her." PELAGAU, *ibid.*, 106 No. X 5.³

The phrase also occurs in the sense "after the death of," as has been noted by THUREAU-DANGIN, *Revue d'Assyriologie*, X 94, 18;—
murgu Du-du-ta, "After the death of Dudu." The author wisely refrained from transcribing the sign. Note also *murgu Lù-ka-ni*

¹ *Nouveaux Vocabulaires Babyloniens*, Paris, 1919, Ernest Leroux.

² Text *LUM*. This text is erroneously rendered *gum-ba-gur-ra-ta*, by PELAGAUD, *Babyloniaca*, III 108; GÉNOUILLAC, RA VIII 5 read *ingar ba-gur-ra-ta*, "She turned to the wall." GÉNOUILLAC at any rate identified the sign correctly. WITZEL wrote a note on this passage in OLZ. 1914, 59 in which he maintained that *gum-ta* means, "because." His interpretation was comparatively correct, but the reading was also erroneous.

³ This text is also published by GÉNOUILLAC, *Inventaire*, 6555.

pa-te-si-ka-ta, "After the death of Lukani, the patesi," GENOUILLAC, *Inventaire*, 6520.

The repeated substitution of the sign *LUM* for *INGAR* (*murgu*) is perplexing but is obviously due to the great similarity of these signs. Syllabar B does not group these two signs together, see CT. XII 25, 17 + 19 + 20 where *LUM* is discussed. Then follows [*ki-it: KAD*] = *kitû* and [*aš-ta:*] *X*¹ = *rigmu*. My restoration of this line *mur: INGAR* = *rigmu* was erroneous. The sign *INGAR* or *MURGU* does not occur on the known fragments of Syl. B and the scribes of the Hammurabi period did not regard them as similar or connected. On the other hand the Neo-Babylonian syllabaries did treat them together² and the citations given above from tablets of the Ur and Isin periods shew that they were confused in the age in which Syl. B was probably composed.

¹ Sign correctly restored by DELITZSCH, AL 5, 110.

² See CT. XII 24 and Vocabulary Scheil.

THE ANAPHORA OF ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM ¹

Translated by SAMUEL A. B. MERCER, Western Theological Seminary, Chicago

<THE INTRODUCTION>

MAY his prayer and his benediction be with us for ever and ever.
Amen.

<THE THANKSGIVING>

The deacon shall say

Let your thoughts be on high; let your heart be in heaven. Think on that which ye are enacting, listen to the word of truth, and receive the glad news.

The priest shall say

Behold, we announce the existence of the Father, which was before the world was created, and which will be for ever. Nothing was before him, and nothing will be after him; nothing is like him, and nothing can express how he was made. He was before all things; before the heavens were spread out, and before the dry land appeared; before the mountains were established, and before the height of firmament was measured was he in his essence. Before the deep was formed, and before the springs of water came forth; before the waterfloods were assembled, was he in his essence. Before the storms raged and the tempest roared, before the lightning glanced, and before the thunder rolled; before the dark clouds spread abroad, was he in his essence. Before the lights changed, and before darkness was spread abroad; before the light of the world shone forth, and before the night sank in sleep, was he in his essence. Before the sun reigned as the light of day, and before the moon had dominion over the depth of night, was he in his essence. Before the stars shone, and before the wind began to blow; before the angels were created, was he in his essence. Before a speaker breathed, and before the body could die; before the whole visible and invisible creation, above and below, was he in his essence.

¹ Mercer Ms. Eth. 3, 148a-157b.

Before time and hour, before day and night; before months and years, and before all possible times, was he in his essence. His praise and his worship overflow, and his grace is full of richness. Let us therefore praise the greatness of his loving kindness, which is manifested upon us, which cannot be numbered, nor can it be measured. Then the advice of the accursed serpent led us into misfortune; it cast us out of the garden of happiness into misfortune, out of life into death, out of freedom into slavery, and it brought us under the yoke of sin. But he did not forsake us, nor did he cease to care for us, his creatures; he did not take vengeance on us because of our sins. We were completely lost after we had sinned against him, but he loved us and cared for us. He had compassion upon us, he protected us and was long-suffering towards us; he delivered us from the hand of him who had us in his power. He sent us his Son as Saviour and Redeemer, the messenger of his good pleasure, his right hand, his strong arm, his power and his wisdom, full of his grace. By it he accomplished all in this world which he desired. All whom he chose, he invited; all whom he invited, he loved; all whom he loved, he honoured; all whom he honoured, he justified; all whom he justified, he made holy; and all whom he made holy, were ordained that they might be constituted his sons. By it he gathered us from dispersion into propagation of the faith; he made us into a united people, and joined us to himself, for his glory; and he wrote our name in the book of life in order that our names may be in his presence with those of the living and dead.

<THE INTERCESSION>

The deacon shall say

For the sake of those who sleep.

The priest shall say

Then, let us announce the essence of the only-begotten; how he created himself; then, how he accomplished his coming to earth; and how his birth took place. He came without leaving his Father; he descended without separating himself from his essence; he came without changing his trinity; he abased himself without surrendering his unity; he assumed abode in flesh without making himself like the abode.

The deacon shall say

Ye who sit, stand up.

He dwelt in the womb without being in any way confined; he covered himself in his mother's womb without being in any way insignificant; he was born without his worth being in any way impaired.

The deacon shall say

Look to the east.

The priest shall say

He was perfect man, yet without sin; he appeared as a servant while he accomplished deeds like a god, yet he was obedient.

Let us announce his gospel

The deacon shall say

Let us give heed.

The priest shall say

He was beloved by his Father; and glorified by the angels; he was honored by men, and praised and sanctified by himself. Heaven and earth are full of the holiness of thy glory. Never shall we cease, then, in our hearts, to make known the holiness of thy glory, saying, holy.

The deacon shall say

Respond.

The priest shall say

Holy, Holy, Holy art thou,
Who art in truth Jesus Christ,
Who art declared holy by the mouth of all,
Who hast made all things holy, so that they are holy.

This is indeed his holiness — it cannot be destroyed, nor can it be lost; no eye hath beheld it; no ear hath heard it; nor hath it entered into the heart of man what the Lord has prepared for those who love him. To his holy disciples and his righteous apostles he hath made known the rite of the mystery of the eucharist.

<THE INSTITUTION>

The deacon shall say

Lift up.

The priest shall say

He took the bread in his holy, and pure, and blessed hands, which are without stain, he looked up to heaven, towards thee his Father, Lord, and God Almighty; and above all, giving thanks, he blessed and brake and gave to his disciples, and said to them: "This is my body, true food of righteousness, whoever eats of it shall have eternal life. Take, eat of it all of you." In like manner he mixed the cup of water and wine, and giving thanks, he blessed, and sanctified, and gave to them, and he said to them: "This is my blood, drink of true life, whoever drinks of it shall live forever. Take, drink of it all of you. It is a sign for you and for your posterity, and thus make memorial of me till I come. And whenever ye come together in my name, ye shall announce my death, my resurrection, and my ascension into heaven."

The deacon shall say

We shall announce thy death.

<THE INVOCATION>

The priest shall say

And we, as oft as we do it, shall announce the death of him who dies not, shall announce the passion of him who suffers not. In the same night in which he sat at table with his disciples, he surrendered himself to death, by the will of his Father and by his own will. They seized him, the Lord of all; they bound him, who embraces all; and confined the Son of the living God. They dragged him in anger, and he followed in love; they lead him, and he followed them like a gentle lamb which opened not its mouth against those who sheared it. Before a judge they led him, before whom the arch-angels stand in fear trembling; they condemned him, who takes away sins; and they crucified him, who will be the judge of judges. They crowned him with a crown of thorns, whom the Seraphim crown with diadems; in order to mock him they clothed him in a

purple mantle, whom the Cherubim clothe with royal garments. A godless slave, with his hand, smote him in the face, before whose presence the Cherubim clothe and cover themselves with fiery wings. In order to mock him, they bent the knee before him, to whom the hosts of angels adore with exceeding great fear. O humility, what boundless humility! O repose, what boundless repose! O benevolence, what boundless benevolence! O love, what boundless love! O lover of men! Love drove the almighty Son from home, and drove him even to death. They crucified him like a malefactor, him, in whom was no sin; they counted him with sinners, who is the substance of life. O hands, which createdest mankind, ye were pierced with nails on the cross! O feet, which bore him in the garden, ye were pierced with nails on the cross! O mouth, which breathed in man the breath of life, thou didst receive bitter gall and vinegar! Where is the mouth, where the lips and the tongue which are able to describe the suffering of the Only-begotten! The heart torn, the understanding confused, the soul fearful, the body helpless — O who can explain the pain of love! He is dead, who cannot die; he is dead, although he overcame death; he is dead, although he gave life to the dead!

The deacon shall say

Weep and lament for him, ye who love him!

The deacon shall say

Io, io, io, Emmanuel, our God!

The priest shall say in like manner

Io, io, io, Jesus, our Saviour! Io, io, io, Christ, our king! Io, io, io, they took him down from the tree; the righteous came and brought spices mingled with myrrh and a pure linen cloth in which to wrap his body.

Then shall he place the cross down quietly, and shall pass to the centre with the censer and with the priests who serve, saying, Holy, Holy, Holy, for thou wast crucified and hast risen again.

The priest shall say

On the third day his soul returned to his body; he arose from the dead uninjured, without corruption, and delivered us from the

yoke of sin. With his body, together with the power of his god-head, he ascended to heaven, to the former condition of his essence.

The deacon shall say

Bow down the head.

The priest shall say

We pray and beseech thee, O God, that thou wouldst send thy Holy Ghost, who will sanctify our soul, our body, and purify us from all our sin; and that we may draw near to offer up thy holy and divine mystery; for to thee be the kingdom, the power, and the glory, for ever and ever.

The priest shall say as before

Remember, O Lord, thy promised word, which thou didst covenant with our fathers and with thy holy apostles, that thou wouldst send upon us thy Holy Ghost, whom the world is unable to receive. Receive us as thy suppliants, as all say: Our Father, who art in heaven; hallowed by thy name; thy kingdom come, that is, of thy Holy Spirit, which is not insignificant and not diminished, for ever and ever.

Here the deacon spits

May he come from heaven, from high heaven, that he may bless this bread, *here he blesses*, and sanctify my offering, *here saying: let them bring the bread*, which is truly thy holy body, *and then let them bring the chalice*, which is truly thy blood. Let him unite himself with this bread and this chalice, that it may be sanctified and made holy from fault, and that there may be a resurrection from the dead to the inheritance of a heavenly kingdom and to everlasting life. Amen.

<THE COMMUNION>

The deacon shall say

With all your heart.

The priest shall say

Let us offer a befitting prayer.

O this mystery, which is not manifest, and which cannot be fathomed! What is his name, and what the name of his Father? Whence is his origin, and who knows the place of his source? The

thoughts of the heart cannot penetrate nor enter him, since speech can neither reach its ground nor can it express its condition, whether former or present. He himself manifests himself and his Father, according as we can receive it, for he is indeed our Saviour, who came into the world, clothed with a body, which he received from us. He it is whom we offer, our Saviour, even as he was offered on Calvary for the life of the whole world. But it was not as ye see this bread, moist and baked, which is touched and handled, but it is the fire of the god-head, which scorches the godless and burns sinners. Hear and know it! Beware therefore, O brethren in the faith! Saying: if a stain is on the body of any one of us, or a sin on his soul, then let him go forth, and let him not approach; and if anyone has revenge in his heart, then let him abide and not draw near. But, whoever is clean in body and soul, he is fortunate; let such a one draw near and confess his sins for God our Lord is merciful.

The deacon shall say

Pray.

The priest shall say

The goodness of God endureth from everlasting to everlasting. This is indeed the goodness of God, that he sent his Only-begotten Son, who took away the sins of the world. This is indeed the goodness of God, that he gave to the priesthood words of fire, whereby they loose the bonds of sin, even as God, our Lord, frees us from the bonds of death. Our Father, who art in heaven.

The deacon shall say

Our Father who art in heaven.

The priest shall say

Forgive, that he may forgive you; pardon, that he may pardon you. Pray, that ye enter not into temptation. It is a misfortune when one treats his body in an evil manner or fearlessly spills his own blood, while there is on him the stain of sin. When, however, there is cleanness in the heart, holiness in the soul, and the body is spotless, then should we approach our Saviour. Come let us pray and supplicate him.

The priest shall say

The hosts of the angels of the Saviour of the world stand before the Saviour of the world, they crown him, the Saviour of the world, even the body and the blood of the Saviour of the world. And let us come before the face of the Saviour of the world; in the faith of Christ let us follow.

<THE BENEDICTION>

The priest shall say

Before the sanctity of thy holiness, etc. *Then placing his hand and turning around*, bless you, bless you, bless you, O flock, united to Christ. Ye shall eat, and shall be satisfied; ye shall drink, and your thirst shall be quenched. Return in peace to your fathers. The Lord be with you all. And with thy spirit.

REVIEWS

Jewish Theology Systematically and Historically Considered. By Dr. K. Kohler. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1918. Pp. xiii + 505. \$2.50 net.

One of the most useful of recent books is this by one of the most representative of Jewish writers of the present day. Dr. Kohler writes from the Reformed Jewish point of view. This work corresponds to the discipline so long known in Christianity as *Systematic Theology*. In presenting the work to the public the publishers say: "This is the first complete systematic presentation of Jewish Theology to appear in English; the work of a scholar of international reputation now president of the Hebrew Union College. Its five hundred pages give a detailed yet popular exposition of the belief of Judaism. It will serve both as a text-book for students and as a general source of enlightenment for Jewish and Christian readers." This is the author's *Grundriss* entirely rewritten, making it a new book.

The book is divided into the following main divisions: Part I: God; Part II: Man; Part III: Israel and the Kingdom of God. The present reviewer has read this work twice in the little more than a year of its existence and highly recommends it as a scholarly piece of work, timely, and filling a much felt want.

Of course it is not a *Christian* Theology, and to compare it with such works would not be fair, the fairer thing being to compare it with other *Jewish* theologies by *Christian* writers such as Weber, Bousset, Herford, etc. As a Jewish Theology it naturally makes the best case possible for Judaism, and for this we are grateful. However, we doubt if there is such a difference from a credal point of view fundamentally as the author makes on pp. 5 and 6, for negative doctrines (p. 20) are still dogma. He speaks, in comparing Judaism with Christianity, of certain things which "prevented its stagnation by dogmatic formulas" (p. 10). Did Christianity stagnate? Does it not present as much vitality as Judaism? Other sections of the book seem to grant this (cf. the chapter on Chris-

tianity and Islam in relation to Judaism, Ch. LVII). If they are "Daughter Religions" and have extended Judaism, then Christianity has not stagnated.

The author is not clear as to the starting point of Judaism. What relation has Ezra to Judaism? and the Law to Judaism? Dr. Kohler grants for Judaism indebtedness to Babylon, Persia, Greece, etc. He says that Judaism is multifarious and manifold. Then, does he mean to say that Christianity is not? If he really understood Christianity in all its forms, he would see that Judaism has no advantage in this matter. He insists that Christianity permits the Deity to be degraded into the sphere of the sensual and human, and would have us believe that Judaism has never done such a thing. The anthropomorphisms that the Rabbinic theologians, especially the Haggadists, make use of, and which Dr. Kohler says were never meant to be taken seriously, must bear at least somewhat on this matter. Again, there are tendencies — and even more than tendencies — towards personification and even personalization in Scripture and the Rabbinic writings, which show Judaism not so far from Christianity as the writer would have us believe. Did not the fact that Christianity enunciated the doctrine of the Trinity prevent Judaism from a like thing, at least in part? As to the actual relation between Judaism and Christianity, we would recommend a note by Oesterley in the Introduction to Dr. Charles's little volume *The Apocalypse of Baruch and the Assumption of Moses* (p. xix) in *Translations of Early Documents*, No. 9. In the *Jewish Theology*, p. 325, too pointed a distinction is drawn between Israel on the one hand and the Greeks and Romans on the other as to the consciousness of election to a world task. His presentation is altogether too ideal. Perhaps Israel was no more conscious of a divine call in ethics and religion than Greece was in art and Rome in law. At least we do not today consider evolution to be so conscious a matter. In fact Israel's great men often indicate that Israel herself is blind to her world task.

There are some typographical errors and some inconsistencies of spelling which mar a book otherwise most excellent, but these *slips* are not plentiful. Dr. Kohler has done a most useful piece of work.

D. ROY MATTHEWS.

Growth of Religious and Moral Ideas in Egypt. By Samuel A. B. Mercer. Moorehouse Publishing Company, Milwaukee, 1919. Pp. ix, pl. 109. \$1.50 net. *Religious and Moral Ideas in Babylonia and Assyria.* By Samuel A. B. Mercer. Moorehouse Publishing Company, Milwaukee, 1919. Pp. xiv, pl. 129. \$1.50 net. *The Book of Genesis for Bible Classes and Private Study.* By Samuel A. B. Mercer. Moorehouse Publishing Company, Milwaukee, 1919. Pp. xiii, pl. 193. \$1.25 net.

These three books by the Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament in The Western Theological Seminary, Chicago; Rector of the Society of Oriental Research and Editor of its Journal; Editor of the Anglican Theological Review; Author of Extra-Biblical Sources for Hebrew and Jewish History, A Sumerian Sign List, and The Ethiopic Liturgy are just off the press. They, together with many other publications in journals, show a good year's work on the part of Dr. Mercer. These books are published in the *Biblical and Oriental Series*, and their function is best set forth in an introductory note by the General Editor of the series, Dr. Mercer: "The object of this series on the Bible and Oriental Civilization is to make the results of expert investigation accessible to laymen" etc. "To laymen" is the phrase of importance. Our learning will be judged as to its usefulness by the way it fits the need of laymen. In Germany such series as the *Sammlung Goeschen*, and in England *The Cambridge Manuals of Science and Literature*, etc. have done much to popularize the results of scientific and scholarly investigation. Perhaps the *Open Court Publishing Company* has done more than any other corporation in America in this direction. *The Biblical and Oriental Series* is decidedly *Christian* and *Religious*. A brief note on each of these books will help the readers of these reviews to decide something of their value.

Growth of Religious and Moral Ideas in Egypt. The reason for a study of Egyptian Religions and Moral Ideas is expressed in the first paragraph of the preface (p. vii). A "Chronological Outline of Egyptian History," following Breasted, is placed first, where it should be, and makes for the general usefulness of the book. A proper estimate of the religious ideas of the Egyptians (cf. pp. 6, 7, and 8) is maintained throughout. The work is simply and carefully illustrated by homely references. There is a high appreciation of

Ikhnaton as an individualist. "He came nearer a pure understanding of the spirit of God than any other man of his time" (p. 41). Dr. Mercer considers Ikhnaton only a *henotheist* not a *monotheist*, and maintains his point, referring to an article by himself in JSOR, Vol. III, No. 2, Oct., 1919. This is a good corrective for such interpretation as makes Ikhnaton a pure monotheist.

Religious and Moral Ideas in Babylonia and Assyria. As in the work on the religious ideas in Egypt, a "Chronological Outline of Babylonian and Assyrian History" is given. The Introduction is beautifully written and shows a spirit decidedly and devoutly religious, and still keenly historical. The picture of religion as a temple and individual cults as pillars therein is effective.

This work clearly denies *ethical monotheism*, or any monotheism, to Babylonians and Assyrians, making even the *locus classicus* "Ea is the Marduk" etc. of the Neo-Babylonian tablet less than monotheistic. The author of *Was Ikhnaton a Monotheist?* (JSOR, Vol. III, No. 2, Oct. 1919) might be expected to make short shrift of the fine-spun, but impossible, theories of monotheism in Babylonia and Assyria (p. 31). He finds here only a *tendency* towards monotheism, and thinks Assyria would more likely have developed monotheism than Babylonia (p. 32).

Some few errors must be noted: p. 41, last line, "All suffering resulted in sinfulness" is probably not what was meant; p. 44, l. 12, "If he divorce the former and disinherit the latter, he was liable" etc. hardly regards sequence of tenses. Yet the English is generally pure and grammatical, typographical errors being almost totally lacking.

The Book of Genesis for Bible Classes and Private Study. This book is in the form of studies by the day, running 240 days. We are here given a book for lay use and at the same time for the general clergy. "This book is designed for a year's work in Biblical Introduction and the Book of Genesis. There are sections on Revelation, Inspiration, and Biblical Archaeology, besides numerous discussions on the ethical, social, and religious teachings of Genesis. References are given to collateral reading; there are directions for the writing of papers and theses; and many questions are introduced to stimulate independent and original thought." This plan has been widely followed with varying success by Y. M. C. A.

study classes, magazines like the *Biblical World*, and Institutes for study such as the American Institute of Sacred Literature. Such study books ought to be successful, although often they are not. This *Genesis* is certainly out of the ordinary run of such books.

Dr. Mercer is here the careful teacher as well as the versatile scholar that he always is. The book rather subtly introduces a modern point of view without causing, at least consciously, a shock or a break with the past. Still our author is hardly clearly enough modern in dealing with these early *Genesis* narratives, but he errs in the right direction. Perhaps he could not be more obviously modern and yet serve his purpose of preparing a book useful to laymen and the less scholarly of the clergy. But the scholar and the scholarly attitude show through.

The literature cited is thoroughly up-to-date, yet enough has not been cited, but this is again the limitation caused by the purpose of the book and lack of space. Yet we ought at least to have in a modern work on *Genesis* a select bibliography, as this is in many cases — not certainly in this — the chief value of a book.

Other books of this nature are proposed in this series, but the proportion of Biblical Study books will be small compared with that of those written on another plan. This is as it should be. We commend this work most highly as one which even scholars need not disdain to use, as no more useful or successful work of this kind has been published. Here, as elsewhere, the work of Dr. Mercer is surprisingly free from typographical and other errors. We have not confirmed his references and cannot speak for their accuracy. The Moorehouse Publishing Company has done a beautiful piece of press work in all these books. The binding is good, and the paper a delight. They are mechanically perfect and beautiful, the mechanical work suiting the excellent contents.

D. ROY MATTHEWS.

The Book of Genesis: A Jewish Interpretation. By Julian Morgenstern. The Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Cincinnati, 1918, Pp. viii, pl. 325.

Professor Morgenstern has written this book for two different publics, laymen and scholars not of the first rank. This he frankly confesses in his preface, although the confession is a dangerous one.

"The two publics which this book now seeks to reach are those of the professional Jewish religious school teacher . . . and the non-professional Jewish Bible student, whose thirst for knowledge and whose Jewish loyalty and interest impel him to seek greater knowledge of Judaism for himself" (p. v.). Despite the fact that the book is "Jewish" it is good for a "Christian" public, for there are many things in it of value. Perhaps the necessity of writing with a religious goal has given a religious bias.

Dr. Morgenstern finds fault with the many *analytic* discussions of Genesis because they miss the *Jewish spirit* of the book. He insists that, while his treatment is to be scientific, it is also to be "synthetic, constructive, and Jewish."

The *Introduction* takes thirty-five pages. Then follow twenty-four *lessons*. The book is fully illustrated, there being thirty-four plates, chiefly archaeological in nature. It is a great pity that these plates are so old, out of date, and practically worthless, for they, together with the fact the paper is glazed and heavy, mar a book with many good features.

It is interesting that in carrying out his plan to write a *Jewish* Genesis, the author considers Bible instruction to have for its purpose not the teaching of morals, but the making of good Jews. They might conceivably be identical.

There is a frank confession that the Creation-and-Flood narratives were borrowed from Babylonia. The legendary character of the patriarchal stories is stressed.

Our author says that Christianity sees in the serpent the devil, the power of evil, "Judaism, however, knows nothing of the devil" (p. 61). How about Hebraism? Is there no Satan in the Old Testament? Why not say "Certain forms of Christianity" found in the serpent, etc.? Why contrast the worst form of Christianity with the best form of Judaism. This is exactly what Jewish writers continually do, however. The book is too decidedly *Jewish* for our day, even if it is to be used as a text in a Jewish school of religion.

There is a too frequent use of "myth" for "legend." Does not the author know the generally accepted difference between the two? or is he just careless in the use of terms?

There are several errors: p. 152, l. 9 of the notes "he" for "be";

p. 33, l. 7 "plently" for "plenty"; p. 152 "Ginsburg" but p. 35 "Ginzberg," Legends of the Jews; p. 153 "born" for "borne"; p. 154 "Robertson-Smith" should not be hyphenated. A scholar as important as William Robertson Smith deserves to have his name properly spelled.

This book may serve its purpose well for a Jewish school of religion, but it is published too provincially and circulated too narrowly to be used by a very large public, which is too bad for it contains some good material.

D. ROY MATTHEWS.

Transliterations of Selected Texts. By Elihu Grant. May, 1919. Professor Grant here publishes privately fifty-nine texts, mostly from a private collection in the possession of Mr. William T. Grant, Jr., of Pelham Manor, New York. In Vol. 34, 199-204, of the AJSL the same author wrote a critical note, entitled "Balmun-amhe, the slave dealer," in which he describes these texts, stating that the majority of them have to do with the slave business. In this new publication, Professor Grant transliterates and translates eight of the texts with a view to showing their general character, and he summarises the variant phrases used with reference to the loan of slaves. It is a pity that the author did not analyse all of the published texts, collecting names and other data that might be interesting to students. But we are thankful to him for publishing the cuneiform texts in such a clear and readable manner.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER.

A History of the Jews in Modern Times. By Max Raisin. New York: Hebrew Publishing Company, 1919, pp. 466. \$2.50 net.

If any student of Semitics wants to become acquainted with the achievements of a very talented race, he can do no better than to read this book. It is not a technical work, but was written with the object of popularizing what Judaism has done in the last few generations. Besides giving valuable information about recent Jewish activities in Europe and America, the author discusses with much insight the Zionist Movement and the modern question of Palestine. He ends with a very useful bibliography and index.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER.

